

**Agenda**  
**Hunters Point Shipyard**  
**Property Transfer Conference Call**  
**Regulatory Agencies, Navy, City and Fivepoint**

**Thursday, March 26, 2020**  
**9:30 to 11:30 am**

***Conference Call Number sent on calendar invite***

**1) Introductions**

EPA – Brianna, Maeve, John, Wayne, Yolanda  
Navy – Paul, Marvin, Derek, Thomas  
City – Amy, Kasheica, Christina (contractor)  
FivePoint – Carolyn  
DTSC – Nina, Brook

**2) Agenda Review**

**3) Dates for:** next Conference Call April 29, next, next in-person meeting June 3

**4) Parcel G WP & related and 5YR including Tech Memos**

**Parcel G Work Plan Addendum**

- EPA is reviewing the final addendum and will have additional comments.
- EPA's main question on the air monitoring is "will this protect nearby workers and neighbors." We have concerns.
- EPA also has concerns about how the air monitoring data will be collected, because this is not outlined in the SAP. We are hopeful a discussion between QA offices between EPA and Navy will help alleviate concerns in the SAP issue.
  - EPA's site attorney will be talking with Navy attorney (Bart?) about the Parcel G ROD identifying the NESHAP as an applicable ARAR during remedial action.
  - Parcel D ROD does not there was any expectation these values would be exceeded.
- Navy doesn't believe the approach is "less protective." Navy is operating in a context where there is pending litigation where concerns about exposures might be considered an issue.
- John suggested that EPA is just trying to have the Navy comply with the ROD. In addition, the best way to communicate to the public is to have data to back it up.
- EPA reminded the Navy that confirmatory sampling is the best way to show the public the dust management practices implemented by the Navy are appropriate.
- Carolyn asked if there would be a delay.

- Navy suggested there are many other things that are pushing the schedule. Right now the big focus is on the background report. Navy said the push-out is from May to June for the schedule.
- Navy thanked Maeve for clarifying the remaining issues and looks forward to the upcoming discussions

### **Soil reference background study**

- We want to be poised to implement fieldwork, once it's safe to do so after COVID-19
- EPA reminded folks the Navy did sampling last fall in five areas, four on-site and one at San Bruno Mountain (off-site).
  - There was about 300 samples from the five areas, and the challenge is how you use that data to develop a single background value to apply across the site. There need to be choices on the statistics you use and how you combine the data. This is particularly challenging, because of the variability of the soil at the site.
  - The choices that the Navy made in the draft report seem to establish fairly high background levels. In some instances, the level chosen is higher than some of the actual sampling results. The statistics proposed seemed to greatly reduce the chances of a false positive (meaning that it's unlikely the Navy would cleanup soil that represents background); this increases the chance of a false negative (meaning that soil that was impacted could be left in place).
- Navy mentioned their contractor will be helping everyone understand how to implement different background levels.

### **Buildings long-term protectiveness evaluation**

- EPA is expecting a report from the US ACE regarding a comparison between RESRAD and BPRG Calculator.
- EPA could likely support the use of RESRAD, with some modifications. We will brief our management soon and hope to conclude the evaluation by the end of April.

### **Questions about the other Workplans**

- Wayne suggests he hasn't looked at it, yet.
- EPA reminded folks the original plan was to get these workplans after the Parcel G work plan was agreed to from all agencies. Unfortunately, this didn't happen that way.
- Navy noted there will not be an addendum for the other work plans.
- Navy (Marvin) suggested this should be a breezy process. EPA noted it should have been, but now these have been issued in draft forms before EPA has yet to approve the Parcel G Work Plan. So, the breeziness of this is challenging.
- The City wanted to remind folks, past discussions were to prioritize UC-1, UC-2, and D-2 after the Parcel G work.

### **Annual RMT and O&M Inspection and IC checklist from OCII**

- EPA/DTSC/Navy should have received this in January (from Ryan at Geosyntec). When should OCII expect comments? Please send comments to Daniel Hanson and Randy Branch.
- EPA will talk with Karen and get back to OCII.
- Navy is checking if it was received.

#### **D-1 Discussion on Post-ROD document**

- Navy said the status hasn't changed. Navy should be sending something to the regulatory agencies from the site attorney.
- DTSC is working with their geologist to better characterize the area to better understand historical fill layers to inform the decision on where the "line" to identify where the fill from the Bay sediment begins/ends. They are reviewing historical boring logs. This information will help CDPH in its evaluation.
- EPA reminded the City to add the items to the agenda that they want to discuss so we can be prepared (this was not on the agenda).

### **5) Updates on communications and meetings**

Response email to Golden Gate University, Environmental Law and Justice Clinic's email on the ROD language for Radium-226. Response letter to Golden Gate University, Environmental Law and Justice Clinic's letter in December 2019.

EPA received a SF Chronicle media inquiry on FUDS program oversight for Buildings 830 and 831. DTSC received a similar request and provided a report from the US ACE FUDS program. EPA reminded everyone that these buildings represent people who have participated in the biomonitoring efforts.

Waiting for Navy to share the RAB reevaluation discussion. Navy is still working on the decision memo. EPA is patiently and enthusiastically waiting for the community survey results the Navy did in Dec/Jan. Navy will share the results at the same time as the memo (hopefully in April). EPA recognizes this is a Navy decision, but we have already received questions from Greenaction and the clinic whether EPA will support the request to start a RAB.

#### **FOIA**

- EPA mentioned we are working on a FOIA for Parcel G and E data evaluations (from Hanson and Bridgett). Two new FOIAs from the same requestor came in.
- DTSC has a one from Hanson and Bridgett.
- Navy has two new ones from a lawyer on the east coast (Mark C, LLC). One about the findings report and about the oversight of Tetra Tech's work.

### **6) Miscellaneous Items**

DTSC requested the Navy to update folks on essential versus not essential work from the Navy at the site. Navy will update the BCT as soon as possible.

Shipyard Advisors, LLC.

- OCII has been instructed to continue to work with Five-Point staff, just as normal operations. Of course, there have been some management that have left the company.
- Carolyn did not have any updates.

## **7) Action Items**